

March 7, 2005

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee (CPC)

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate
University Planning

Subject: **Record of the February 22, 2005 CPC meeting**

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), Janna Alley, G. Z. Brown, Michael Fifield, Rich Linton, Gregg Lobisser, Colin McArthur, Steve Pickett, Chris Ramey, Robert Ribe, Michael Stamm, Greg Stripp, Christine Theodoropoulos

Guests: Meghann M. Cuniff (ODE), Zach Vishnoff, Lauren Wimer (ODE)

Staff: Christine Thompson (University Planning)

Agenda: **Long Range Campus Development Plan Update - Introduction to the Proposed Revisions**

1. Long Range Campus Development Plan Update - Introduction to the Proposed Revisions

Background: The committee chair said the purpose of the meeting was to continue reviewing the draft version of the Campus Plan. She reminded members that it would be most helpful to focus discussion on key issues. If desired, smaller groups can be formed to further discuss issues that require more focused discussion time (similar to the two work sessions that were held previously).

Staff thanked members for their input during the CPC work sessions. She said their comments are not reflected in the draft document, but they will be incorporated into the next version.

Staff described the draft plan's proposed changes associated with the Campus Plan's overall intent and readability, review processes/site selection, and designated open spaces (part) as

outlined in the *Summary of Proposed Revisions* provided in the meeting mailing. She asked for committee feedback.

Staff clarified that the designated open space boundaries for the Science Green are still in question

and will be the subject of a full CPC discussion spring term.

Discussion: Members made the following comments and suggestions about the draft Campus Plan:

- Make the building services refinement policies focus more on the campus as a whole versus individual projects.
- Add language that requires individual projects to consider opportunities to improve campus-wide utility systems when possible. This would include working with Facilities Services.
- Overall, emphasize a coordinated versus piecemeal approach (e.g., for utility systems, open-space design and development, etc).
- Revise the vision statement to express the uniqueness of the University of Oregon campus (e.g., public versus private, special design qualities, unique aspects of the university's mission).
- Describe how conceptual studies fit into the project design and review process. Explain their purpose—to establish a preliminary budget and solicit funds, not define the project design (and, therefore, not subject to CPC review). Clarify how the user group is expected to use conceptual designs—as background information, not as the presumed design.
- Clarify what “project is funded” means since some projects are not entirely funded when the design process is initiated.
- Consider adding an intermediate step in the design and review process to more clearly explain the parameters for selecting a site.
- Support the idea to implement review of off-campus projects (e.g., the UO Portland Center).
- Consider changing the name of the document to reflect that it applies to off-campus projects.
- Consider moving UO-owned off-campus projects to the “B” on-campus project review category to emphasize the goal to meet Campus Plan policies. Note that exceptions to the plan could be made when applicable.
- Ensure that design review occurs throughout the design process so that opportunities are not lost and suggested improvements are not ignored because it is “too late.”
- Strengthen the idea of looking at other opportunities to link a project to larger campus goals during the first CPC meeting described in the review process.
- Address the “face” of the campus—Franklin Boulevard. Create a Franklin artery design area that extends the length of Franklin Boulevard to address this area's special design characteristics and issues. Address the public image, both sides of Franklin, pedestrian crossings, and way finding to the river. Convey the university's positive features to the community—e.g., extend the open-space pastoral qualities to the edge rather than creating a wall of buildings.
- Acknowledge that adjacent streets have a significant impact on the university's character and vice versa. Define existing and desired character of adjacent streets.
- Look at the campus edge as a separate issue. Currently the designated open spaces are inward-focused.
- Define the environmental benefits of open spaces (e.g., light, wind, etc.).

A guest added that the university should address the way buildings are financed. Also, the committee should consider enhancing notification requirements so that the neighborhood members, not just the neighborhood chair are notified about proposed land-use applications.

Staff said review of proposed changes would continue at the committee's next meeting, which is

not yet scheduled. She will poll members to determine if it is possible to hold a meeting prior to spring break. Otherwise the next meeting will be spring term.

Action: No formal action was required. The committee's comments will be taken into consideration when preparing the final version of the document.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

. Meghann M. Cuniff, ODE
Steve Nystrom, Eugene Planning